

(d) what, if any, are the reasons that weighed with the authorities to grant the Cochin Transport Service the through line service Ernakulam—Trichur in preference to the other applicants who are bonafide Cochinites;

(e) what if any are the grounds for continuing the preference in the fare of the other applicants;

(f) are the vehicles owned by the Cochin Transport Service under the control of the responsibility of the Government?

Khan Sahib Y. M. Roshan Sahib Bahadur (Commissioner of Police):

(a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) It is a limited concern.

(d) No such permit is granted.

(e) The question is not understood.

(f) No.

SESSIONS CASE 15 OF 1119—STRICTURES MADE BY THE HIGH COURT AGAINST THE INVESTIGATING OFFICER

371. Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan (Vadakkancheri): Will Government be pleased to state.—

(a) whether their attention has been drawn to the strictures made by the Honourable High Court against the investigating Officer in Sessions Case No. 15 of 1119 in their decision reported at page 111 of 1120;

(b) whether the Sub-Inspector concerned is still in service?

Khan Sahib Y. M. Roshan Sahib Bahadur (Commissioner of Police):

(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

ASSAULT ON LORRY DRIVER

372. Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan (Vadakkancheri): Will Government be pleased to state.—

(a) whether with reference to question No. 264 answered on Friday the 19th January 1945 the inter-Departmental correspondence on the subject of the alleged assault on the Lorry Driver by the Police Commissioner's orderly has been closed;

(b) had the Police Officer who is the author of the alleged assault been questioned in the matter and if so what is his version;

(c) has the matter now been closed and if so how?

Khan Sahib Y. M. Roshan Sahib Bahadur (Commissioner of Police):

(a) Yes.

(b) There was no assault.

(c) Yes. No action is considered necessary.

373. Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan (Vadakkancheri): Will Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the driving license of the Lorry Driver concerned in question No. 372 had been taken away from him after the alleged assault and if taken away whether the same has been returned to him at any subsequent time and if returned when;

(b) whether the lorry in question is being driven by the same driver;

(c) if he is driving under which license, the one possessed by him originally or any other;

(d) if the lorry is being driven under a fresh license who has issued the same?

Mr. S. Venkateswaran (Conservator of Forests):

(a) Yes. It was taken from the driver on 8th Dhanu 1120 and returned to him on 27th Dhanu 1120.

(b) Yes.

(c) He is driving under the original license.

(d) Does not arise in view of reply to (c).

374. Mr. K. Narayana Menon (Mulakunnathukavu): Will Government be pleased to state in continuation of the answers they were pleased to give to question No. 264 at the last session and as supplemental there to.—

- (a) whether the driving license of the driver of the lorry concerned in that question has been suspended;
 (b) whether his driving license has been returned to him;
 (c) if answer to (b) is in the affirmative, the date of the seizure and the date of the return of the license;
 (d) whether the driver was actually driving the vehicle after the driving license was taken away from him;
 (e) if answer to (d) is in the affirmative, on what authority;
 (f) if this driver was not in charge of the vehicle who else was driving the lorry during this period?

Mr. S. Venkateswaran (*Conservator of Forests*):

- (a) No.
 (b) Yes.
 (c) Seized on 8th Dhanu 1120. Returned on 27th Dhanu 1120.
 (d) Yes.
 (e) On the strength of the original license.
 (f) Does not arise in view of reply to (e).

Adjournment motion

Mr. President: I have received notice from Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan to move for the adjournment of the business of the Council to discuss a question connected with the lifting of the ban on public meetings. I am afraid I cannot admit this, as we had a full discussion on this subject some time ago.

Short notice motion

I have also received requests from Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar and Mr. Iyyu to admit short notice motions suggesting the desirability of establishing a convention by which the Minister should resign his office on the dissolution of the Council. I am of the opinion that neither of these motions should be admitted. There has been ample time for Hon'ble Members to give the prescribed notice since the intention to dissolve the Council was announced, and it is most undesirable in my view that a question with such important constitutional implications should be discussed without plenty of opportunity for full preparation and reference to authority.

Legislative Business—Government Bills

The Preservation of Eries Bill

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (*Diwan Peishkar*): I beg to move that the preservation of Eries Bill be taken up and finally passed.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon (*Advocate-General*): I second it.

Motion put and carried

Legislative Business—Non-Official Bills

The Cochin Court Fees Act (Amendment) Bill—

(**Khan Sahib Ismail Hajee Essa Sait**)

Mr. Shabdai S. Koder (*Nominated*): I may be permitted to move the Cochin Court Fees Act (Amendment) Bill, in the absence of the Hon'ble Member.

Mr. President: Has the Hon'ble Member got his authority?

Mr. Shabdai S. Koder (*Nominated*): I have got his verbal instructions.

Mr. A. B. Salem (*Mattancheri*): Under Standing Order No. 42 "the member in charge of the Bill or in his absence any member may move that the Bill or the Bill as amended, as the case may be, be taken up and passed". No authority is required.

Mr. President: I suggest that if the Hon'ble Member in charge of the Bill has sent a message through the Hon'ble Member, we should hear it.

Mr. Shabdai S. Koder (*Nominated*): He has asked me to move on his behalf.

Mr. President: Very well.

Mr. Shabdai S. Koder (*Nominated*): I beg to move that the Cochin Court Fees Act (Amendment) Bill be taken up and finally passed.